

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 and 33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claims 7-9 and 13-15 are allowed.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 10-12 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,949,142 to Otsuka (hereinafter "Otsuka") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,022,761 to Grupen-Shemansky et al. (hereinafter "Grupen-Shemansky"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Otsuka does not disclose the interconnecting pattern not formed on intersurfaces of the holes, as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Otsuka discloses a substrate 4 having a hole formed therein, the hole being defined by subtracting the metal patterns 4a and 4b and the conductive bump 4c from the substrate 4. Further, Otsuka discloses that the metal pattern 4b, which corresponds to an interconnecting pattern, is formed on an intersurface of the hole. Otsuka also discloses that the metal pattern 4b has no flexibility because it is put into the substrate 4.

The Office Action admits that Otsuka does not disclose conductive posts provided contiguously on the electrode. However, the Office Action asserts that this deficiency is made up by Grupen-Shemansky. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action appears to assert that Grupen-Shemansky discloses conductive bumps 13, 21 provided contiguously and directly contacting electrode 27. However, Grupen-Shemansky discloses a conductive metal pad 21, which corresponds to an interconnecting pattern, formed on an inner surface of hole 19. Thus, Grupen-Shemansky does not make up

for the deficiencies of Otsuka as discussed above. Both Otsuka and Grupen-Shemansky do not disclose an interconnecting pattern not formed on intersurfaces of the holes, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable over the applied art. Claims 2-6, 10-12, 16-19 and 33, which depend from claim 1, are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-19 and 33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Sy  
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNS/cfr

Date: July 3, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|  |
|--|
| DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br>AUTHORIZATION<br>Please grant any extension<br>necessary for entry;<br>Charge any fee due to our<br>Deposit Account No. 15-0461 |
|--|